

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/820,218 | CAMMACK | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Anne R. Kubelik | 1638 | |

All Participants:

(1) Anne R. Kubelik.

(2) Robert Hanson.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 5 July 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

6, 15, 19, 20, 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner's amendments were proposed because the lined-out material is inherent to the corn lines, and thus unnecessary and confusing in the claim. Applicant approved the proposed Examiner's amendments

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)